

direction opposite the direction of the first optical signal to cause Raman amplification of the first optical signal.

Claim 35 recites the optical repeater as including a first supervisory unit generating a first supervisory signal and associated with at least one modulator which superimposes the first supervisory signal on a first optical signal , and at least one pump source disposed along the optical fiber and adapted to send onto the optical fiber a pump signal in a direction opposite the direction of the first optical signal to cause Raman amplification of the first optical signal.

Claim 57 recites a method including the steps of superimposing a supervisory signal on a first optical signal and sending a pump signal onto the optical link in a direction opposite the direction of the first optical signal, so as to cause Raman amplification of the first optical signal and of the supervisory signal superimposed on it.

All of these claims include this same special technical feature, i.e., the sending of a pump signal onto the optical link in a direction opposite to the propagation direction of a first optical signal which has a supervisory signal superimposed on it. And this is the feature by which all of these claims distinguish over the prior art. Thus, it is very clear that the claims share “special technical features .... that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.” The undersigned does not see how it is possible to conclude otherwise.

In support of his restriction requirement, the examiner points out that the claims of Group I are directed to an optical transmission system, the claims of Group II are directed to a modulated optical repeater and the claims of Group III are directed to a method of supervising an optical transmission system. This is quite true, but is not germane to the issue of Rules 13.1 and 13.2. The criteria is not whether there is something different in the claims, but whether they share a common special technical feature despite what is different in the claims. It is very clear here that the feature distinguishing all of claims 1, 35 and 57 from the prior art is the same.

For the above reasons, the requirement is traversed and examination of all claims is requested at this time.